



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,370	10/19/2000	Brent Bilger	BILG-400	8637

26379 7590 04/24/2003

GARY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
1755 EMBARCADERO ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94303-3340

EXAMINER

PHAM, THOMAS K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	4

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/693,370	BILGER, BRENT
	Examiner Thomas K Pham	Art Unit 2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. Claims 1-23 of U.S. Application 09/693370 filed on 10/19/2000 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myron et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143 (hereinafter Myron).
5. As for claim 1, Myron shows a room occupancy sensor for a home automation system having a controller that monitors occupancy of rooms in a home, the occupancy sensor comprising: a sensor for detecting motion in a room, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor (col. 11 lines 49-62); a device for measuring ambient room temperature, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to the measured ambient room temperature (col. 7 lines 26-37).

6. As for claim 2, Myron shows the room occupancy sensor of claim 1, wherein the sensitivity is increased as the ambient room temperature increases (col. 7 lines 13-25).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143. Myron shows a room occupancy sensor for a home automation system having a controller that monitors occupancy of rooms in a home, the occupancy sensor comprising: a sensor for detecting motion in a room, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected motion by the sensor (col. 11 lines 49-62).

8. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143.

9. As for claim 3, Humphries shows a home automation system for a home having a plurality of rooms, the system comprising: a plurality of controlled objects for placement in rooms (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line14); a plurality of room motion sensors for placement in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein (col. 13 lines 40-51); and a controller for controlling the controlled objects in response to detected occupancy by the plurality of room motion sensors (col. 4 lines 41-58); Humphries does not specifically show at least one of the room motion sensors includes: a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor, and a device for measuring ambient room temperature, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to the measured ambient room temperature. However, Myron shows at least one of the room motion sensors includes: a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor (col. 11 lines 49-62), and a

device for measuring ambient room temperature, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to the measured ambient room temperature (col. 7 lines 26-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion and temperature sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

10. As for claim 4, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 3, wherein the sensitivity is increased as the ambient room temperature increases. However, Myron shows an occupancy sensor, wherein the sensitivity is increased as the ambient room (col. 7 lines 13-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the temperature sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

11. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143.

12. As for claim 6, Humphries shows a home automation system for a home having a plurality of rooms separated by doorways, wherein each room has at least one of the doorways associated therewith, the system comprising: a plurality of controlled objects for placement in rooms (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line14); a plurality of room motion sensors for placement in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein (col. 13 lines 40-51); and a controller for controlling the controlled objects in response to detected occupancy by the plurality of room

motion sensors (col. 4 lines 41-58). Humphries does not specifically show at least one of the room motion sensors includes a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor, and wherein the sensitivity is adjustable in response to signals from the controller. However, Myron shows at least one of the room motion sensors includes a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, the sensor having a sensitivity to the motion for triggering the room occupancy sensor, and wherein the sensitivity is adjustable in response to signals from the controller (col. 11 lines 49-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

13. As for claim 7, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 6, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected motion by the sensor. However, Myron shows the occupancy sensor, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected motion by the sensor (col. 11 lines 49-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

14. As for claim 8, Humphries shows the home automation system of claim 6, further comprising: a plurality of entry/exit sensors for placement in doorways to detect movement of a person therethrough (col. 13 lines 32-51). Humphries does not specifically show the home

automation system of claim 6, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected movement by at least one of the entry/exit sensors. Myron shows the occupancy sensor, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected movement by at least one of the entry/exit sensors (col. 12 line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

15. As for claim 9, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 6, further comprising: at least one spot sensor for placement in one of the rooms to detect occupancy by a person in a specific location within the one room, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected occupancy in the specific location by the spot sensor. However, Myron shows the occupancy sensor, further comprising: at least one spot sensor for placement in one of the rooms to detect occupancy by a person in a specific location within the one room, wherein the sensitivity is adjusted in response to detected occupancy in the specific location by the spot sensor (col. 14 lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

16. As for claim 10, Humphries shows the home automation system of claim 6, further comprising: at least one status sensor for determining a parameter of the home (col. 11 lines 15-36). Humphries does not specifically show the sensitivity is adjusted in response to the determined parameter by the sensor. However, Myron shows the occupancy sensor sensitivity is

adjusted in response to the determined parameter by the sensor (col. 11 lines 49-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

17. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Eckel U.S. Patent No. 5,946,209.

18. As for claim 11, Humphries does not specifically show a room occupancy sensor for a home automation system having a controller that monitors occupancy of rooms in a home, the occupancy sensor comprising: a sensor for detecting motion in a room, and a filter mechanism for triggering the room occupancy sensor only in response to repeated motion detections by the sensor that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period. However, Eckel shows a motion sensing system comprising: a sensor for detecting motion in a room, and a filter mechanism for triggering the room occupancy sensor only in response to repeated motion detections by the sensor that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period (col. 23 lines 10-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of

motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

19. Claims 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Eckel U.S. Patent No. 5,946,209.

20. As for claim 12, Humphries shows a home automation system for a home having a plurality of rooms separated by doorways, wherein each room has at least one of the doorways associated therewith, the system comprising: a plurality of controlled objects for placement in rooms (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line14); a plurality of room motion sensors for placement in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein (col. 13 lines 40-51); and a controller for controlling the controlled objects in response to detected occupancy by the plurality of room motion sensors (col. 4 lines 41-58). Humphries does not specifically show a home automation system for a home having a plurality of rooms separated by doorways, wherein at least one of the room motion sensors includes: a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, and a filter mechanism associated with the room motion sensor for triggering the room motion sensor only in response to repeated motion detections that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period. However, Eckel shows a motion sensing system includes: a sensor for detecting motion in one of the rooms, and a filter mechanism associated with the room motion sensor for triggering the room motion sensor only in response to repeated motion detections that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period (col. 23 lines

10-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

21. As for claim 13, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 12, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjustable by the controller. Eckel shows the motion sensing system, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjustable by the controller (col. 23 lines 48-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

22. As for claim 14, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 13, wherein for the at least one room motion sensor: the controller counts the number of the repeated motion detections, determines the time separation between the repeated motion detections, and determines the time period in which all the repeated motion detections occur; and the controller determines that the room motion sensor is triggered when the counted motion detections exceed the predetermined number, are separated apart by the predetermined separation time period, and all occur within the predetermined group time period. However, Eckel shows the motion sensing system, wherein for the at least one room motion sensor: the controller counts

the number of the repeated motion detections, determines the time separation between the repeated motion detections, and determines the time period in which all the repeated motion detections occur (col. 23 lines 26-64); and the controller determines that the room motion sensor is triggered when the counted motion detections exceed the predetermined number, are separated apart by the predetermined separation time period, and all occur within the predetermined group time period (col. 24 lines 16-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

23. As for claim 16, Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 13, further comprising: at least one spot sensor for placement in one of the rooms to detect occupancy by a person in a specific location within the one room, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to detected occupancy in the specific location by the spot sensor. However, Eckel shows the home automation system of claim 13, further comprising: at least one spot sensor for placement in one of the rooms to detect occupancy by a person in a specific location within the one room, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to detected occupancy in the specific location by the spot sensor (col. 7 lines 36-58 and col. 23 line 24-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the spot sensor of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for

concentrating the motion detection at a narrower zone and triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

24. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Eckel U.S. Patent No. 5,946,209 and further in view of Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143.

25. As for claim 15, Humphries shows the home automation system of claim 13, further comprising: a plurality of entry/exit sensors for placement in doorways to detect movement of a person therethrough (col. 13 lines 32-51). Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 13, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to detected movement by at least one of the entry/exit sensors. However, Eckel shows the home automation system of claim 13, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to detected movement (col. 23 line 24-64). Furthermore Myron shows at least one of the entry/exit sensors (col. 12 line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with Eckel and Humphries because it would provide for

adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

26. As for claim 17, Humphries shows the home automation system of claim 13, further comprising: at least one status sensor for determining a parameter of the home (col. 11 lines 15-36). Humphries does not specifically show the home automation system of claim 13, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to the determined parameter by the status sensor. However, Eckel shows the home automation system of claim 13, wherein at least one of the predetermined number, predetermined time period and predetermine group time period are adjusted in response to the determined parameter by the sensor (col. 23 line 24-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eckel with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

27. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143.

28. As for claim 18, Humphries shows a method of automated control of a plurality of controlled objects placed in a plurality of rooms in a home, wherein a plurality of room motion sensors are placed in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein, the method comprising the steps of: controlling the controlled objects in response to detected occupancy by the plurality of room motion sensors (col. 13 lines 40-51); and measuring ambient room temperature (col. 15

lines 10-16). Humphries does not specifically show a method of automated control of a plurality of controlled objects placed in a plurality of rooms in a home, wherein a plurality of room motion sensors are placed in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein, the method comprising the steps of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to the measured ambient room temperature. Myron shows a method comprising the steps of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to the measured ambient room temperature (col. 7 lines 13-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the temperature sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

29. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Myron U.S. Patent No. 5,640,143.

30. As for claim 19, Humphries shows a method of automated control of a plurality of controlled objects placed in a plurality of rooms in a home, wherein a plurality of room motion sensors are placed in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein, the method comprising the steps of: controlling the controlled objects in response to detected occupancy by the plurality of room motion sensors (col. 13 lines 40-51); Humphries does not specifically show a method of automated control of a plurality of controlled objects placed in a plurality of rooms in a home, wherein a plurality of room motion sensors are placed in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein, the method comprising the steps of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at

least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected occupancy by at least one of the room motions sensors. However, Myron shows a method comprising the steps of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected occupancy by at least one of the room motions sensors (col. 11 lines 49-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

31. As for claim 20, Humphries shows the method of claim 19, wherein the plurality of rooms are separated by doorways which include a plurality of entry/exit sensors for detecting movement of a person therethrough (col. 13 lines 32-51). Humphries does not specifically show the method further comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected movement by at least one of the plurality of entry/exit sensors. However, Myron shows the method further comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected movement by at least one of the plurality of entry/exit sensors (col. 12 line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

32. As for claim 21, Humphries does not specifically show the method of claim 19, wherein the home includes at least one spot sensor for detecting occupancy by a person in a specific

location within the one rooms, the method further comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected occupancy by the spot sensor. However, Myron shows the method comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to detected occupancy by the spot sensor (col. 14 lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

33. As for claim 22, Humphries shows the method of claim 19, wherein the home includes at least one status sensor for determining a parameter of the home (col. 11 lines 15-36). Humphries does not specifically show the method further comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to the home parameter determined by the status sensor. However, Myron shows the method further comprising the step of: adjusting a sensor trigger sensitivity of at least one of the room motion sensors in response to the home parameter determined by the status sensor (col. 11 lines 49-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensor of Myron with the home automation system of Humphries because it would provide for adjusting the sensitivity of the sensor in order to send the most accurate information back to the main controller of the system.

34. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphries U.S. Patent No. 5,621,662 in view of Eckel U.S. Patent No. 5,946,209. Humphries does not

specifically show a method of automated control of a plurality of controlled objects placed in a plurality of rooms in a home, wherein a plurality of room motion sensors are placed in the rooms to detect occupancy by a person therein, the method comprising the steps of: triggering one of the room motion sensors only in response to repeated motion detections that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period; and controlling at least one controlled object in response to the triggered room motion sensor. However, Eckel shows a method comprising the steps of: triggering one of the room motion sensors only in response to repeated motion detections that exceed a predetermined number, that are each separated apart by a predetermined separation time period, and that all occur within a predetermined group time period (col. 24 lines 16-37); and controlling at least one controlled object in response to the triggered room motion sensor (col. 23 lines 26-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion sensing system of Eckel with the automation system of Humphries because it would provide for triggering the sensors from the number of motion detection occurrences including a filtering mechanism in order to reduce false valid occupant signal.

Art Unit: 2121

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thomas Pham; whose telephone number is (703) 305-7587 and fax number is (703) 746-8874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30AM- 4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *John Follansbee*, can be reached on (703) 305-8498 or via e-mail addressed to [joh.follansbee@uspto.gov]. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-5403.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [thomas.pham@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thomas K. Pham
Patent Examiner

tp

April 16, 2003

*Wilbert L. Starks, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit - 2121*

